THE EISENHOWER LIBRARY
3 1151 02718 7065

Indian copy. found
in old book shop

Syllabification and Accent
in
Paradise Lost

A Dissertation
Presented to the Board of University
Studies of the Johns Hopkins University
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

By

George Dobbin Brown

1900

Bridges	94.	1 –
Schipper '81-8.		9 –
Masson	'74.	6 –
Ellis	'48, '69, '76.	5 –
Mayor	1886.	10 –
Abbott & Seeley	'79.	7 –
Poe	'47?.	4
ton M. Lewis	'98.	15
Lanier	'80.	8
Gummere	'86.	11
ackinnon Robertson	'97.	14
— [Leigh Hunt	'44].	
th Symonds	'95.	12
Arden Shakespeare	'95-'97.	13
Dr Johnson	1751.	2
Guest	'38.	3

Contents

Introduction pp 1-28
1 Previous views of: [illegible] 3
9 [illegible] [illegible]
6 [illegible] 11
5 [illegible] 12
10 [illegible] [illegible]
7 [illegible] and [illegible] [illegible]
Part I Syllabification [illegible]
A Syllabification within a Word [illegible]
(α) Diphthongs and Hiatus [illegible]
(1) Vowel + a [illegible]
(2) a + vowel [illegible]
(3) Vowel + i [illegible]
(4) i + vowel [illegible]
(5) Vowel + u [illegible]
(6) u + vowel [illegible]
(7) Vowel + [illegible] [illegible]
(8) o + vowel [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible]
(10) u + vowel [illegible]
(11) Other diphthongs and triphthongs [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible]
(β) [illegible] [illegible]
= I Slurring to the right [illegible]
or II " " " left [illegible]
(1) and (2), l. 61 and 63
(3) and (4), m 65 and 66
(5) and (6), n 66 and 68
[illegible] 72 and 76
Comparison of (3) with (α) 79
Summary of phenomena under (3) 83
(γ) Time Syncopation 86-89
B Syllabification between Words 89-95
Nature of interverbal slurring 89
Positions of interverbal hiatus and slurring 90
Customary Slurrings [illegible]
(Of these the slurring of the, -y, + vowel corresponds to [illegible]
[illegible]

Light iamb, heavy iamb, mistaken iamb.

[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible] 91

(Of these 1–4 correspond to A, x
5 corresponds to A, β)

~~Concluding Remarks to Part I~~

Syncopation of a Phrase 94
(corresponds to A, y)

Concluding Remarks to Part I [illegible]

number & position of

Part II, Accents 97–

Poetical utterance & [illegible]

[illegible] in [illegible]

(1) The "pyrrhic" [illegible]

(2) The "spondee", [illegible]

3+4, = 3, a, b, pyrrhic + spondee, [illegible] 105, 6,

Stress conflict [illegible]

List of words [illegible] against accents [illegible]

following th[illegible]

(3) they stand in th[illegible],

(4) [illegible]

(5) [illegible] restrictions.

An effect similar to the Anglo-Saxon verse type
E² may be gained by trochaic substitution, 112–115

[illegible]
[7] [illegible]
[8] (9) " " two words
[illegible]
Ambitious and its fellows
(14) (a) "Pyrrhic" + "spondaic" when final
(b) " + " " non-final
(c) Comparison of (a) and (b) as used
[illegible]

Introduction

In a recent number of The Academy Mr. Le Gallienne regrets that Sidney Lanier spent his precious time and energy on the composition of The Science of English Verse. "Honestly," he continues, "I doubt that such treatises on metre benefit. Not the poets I am thinking. I imagine that Mr. Stephen Phillips would have written as good blank verse though Mr. Robert Bridges's treatise on Miltonic blank verse had never seen that dim light of publicity vouchsafed to technical masterpieces."

We are not concerned with that part of Mr. Le Gallienne's criticism which expresses contempt of learned treatises on metre. Such deliverances on the part of critics of the class to wh. Mr. Le G. belongs, upon the [illegible] of the [illegible] of a study of metric phenomena delight, of course, the

art amateur for whom they are especially composed. To an even greater extent do they amuse the conscientious investigator against whom they are directed. And so no harm is done.

The part of the criticism to which I [illegible] Bridges's essay, for Mr. Le Gallienne ~~voices~~ reproduces the general judgment which has been passed upon that work. Mr. Bridges's treatise, Milton's Prosody, Oxford 1894, is considered ~~[illegible]~~ a [illegible] exposition of the [illegible] principles of Miltonic blank verse. What, then, it may be asked, is the necessity for another such study?

Metricians are agreed upon the type-line in blank verse. Dramatic blank verse [illegible] and ~~[illegible]~~ may be termed [illegible]

With such variations we are not concerned. Non-dramatic blank verse, on the other hand, as in Milton, Wordsworth, Tennyson, adh[illegible] to the [illegible] be termed strict. Even in strict blank verse, however, variations from the norm are frequent. It is with the nature of these variations from the norm in Milton's blank verse (both non-dramatic and dramatic) that the nucleus of Mr. Bridges's paper, pp. 7-45, deals, all the fundamental questions being touched upon in the part concerning Paradise Lost, pp. 7-23. On page 6 Mr. Bridges says, "A regular blank [illegible] [illegible] -ditions: —

(1) In the number of syllables, which is ten;
(2) In the number of stresses, which is five;
(3) In the position of the stresses, which is on the even syllables.

[illegible] made. It
[illegible]

(1) To the number of syllables [illegible]

(2) To the number of [illegible]

(3) To the [illegible]
in regard to [illegible]
the [illegible]
[illegible] thus [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
trisyllabic feet, a[illegible], [illegible]
and tribrach ∪∪∪, (— [illegible]
and ∪ an [illegible] syllable). [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] to attempt it in [illegible]
this paper. Especially in [illegible]
of Milton's vision, [illegible]

used "so as not to imply", as he himself properly remarks, "that anything is cut off, or lost, or not pronounced" (but how the obviation of a syllable does not imply this, is never to be explained), a few words must be said from a phonetic standpoint. [In this general use of the term elision Mr Bridges includes all obviation of an extra syllable (except the very rare syncopation), namely slurring of [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]]

In regard to the questions under (2) and (3) we consider ~~that~~ Mr Bridges is wholly wrong. Under (2) he thinks that we may have an unstressed foot or pyrrhic ◡◡. [illegible]

How this is done [illegible]

not in like manner [illegible] the opposite error of finding feet with two accents as in "this néw wórld", and thus getting a line of more than five accents.

[illegible] stressed, as well as two-stressed, syllables in prose used as a verse foot. But it is [illegible] by making one of these syllables by a verse [illegible] a verse foot with one full accent thus $\smile \overset{\vee}{-}$ (letting $\vee$ mark the verse stress), and [illegible] thus $- \overset{\vee}{-}$. In this way the number of stresses in the line is kept constant and [illegible] should occur), and spondees.

(3) We shall find in regard to the distribution of the five stresses, that the [illegible] of the [illegible] of a verse stress, [illegible]

its normal position on an even syllable to the odd syllable immediately before it (i.e. trochaic substitution) are these: –

(a) It shall not occur in the fifth foot;
(b) [illegible];
(c) It shall occur only after a strong pause, initial or caesural.

In these several aspects of (3), also, Bridges errs. It seemed desirable, therefore, that the [illegible]

We shall now indicate briefly the teachings of the metricians Schipper, Masson, Ellis, Mayor, and Abbott and Seeley, [illegible] while others treat the subject of blank verse in general.

It will be only necessary to quote their

[illegible]

(1) The number of syllables in the line, — [illegible] to be [illegible] the dactyl — ∪ ∪ (— and ∪ being here used of [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

tribrach ∪ ∪ ∪;

(2) The number of verse stresses in the line, — some theories allowing addition to the [illegible]

[illegible]

∪ ∪ ∪ ;

(3) The disposition of stresses, —

[illegible]

[illegible]

stinction [*A non-caesural pause, or dash, being one which occurs, when but would be [illegible] marked verse pause].

Schipper in his "[illegible]" ([illegible] [illegible] be alternative systems. Thus, for example, he has the marked off trisyllabic foot in

I 323 |To adóre| the cónqueror, who nów [illegible]

[illegible]

(2) Two [illegible] as having one and only one verse stress.

(3) When prose stress would demand that the verse stress, to coincide with it, should fall on ~~the~~ preceding odd syllable, there are two methods of treatment according to Schipper. (A) We may have trochaic substitution. He [illegible] this occur however, I think, at impr —

pause, and not after a strong stress, for he argues the knocked off foot in I 1.

Of man's | first disobedience and the fruit.

thus inverting in two successive feet as in [illegible] I 361, where he suggests scanning,

With their [illegible] | to the | bottomless deep,

But he properly forbids trochaic substitution in the [illegible] foot.

Or (B) we may have what he considers to be always a faulty usage, hovering stress. [illegible].

The arsis does not, as in (A), pass forward so as to coincide with the word stress, but instead the stress "hovers" (which I take to be equivalent to "rests practically equal") on the [illegible] [illegible] (or arsis) syllable. Hovering stress is frequent [illegible] when the two syllables [illegible]

[illegible]

in two syllables, ~~thus~~ as in ~~the 5th~~ the 4th foot of

Burnt after them to the | bottomless pit.

[Note that he strangely suggests the [illegible] for Paradise Regained I 20[illegible],

[illegible]

[illegible]

Thus there are according to Schipper two methods of reconciling [illegible] with [illegible] when the [illegible] of the foot. When [illegible] the difference between a light [illegible] and a [illegible] in the same foot [illegible]

[illegible] in [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] ? [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Then you with bloody baton the rout plain.

[illegible]

[illegible] word, and [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] *with* and [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] language, *the* is [illegible] [illegible] ; so far

[illegible] any [illegible] [illegible], a [illegible] word! [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] word in [illegible]. I am

[illegible], [illegible], [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] it [illegible]

[illegible]

recourse to but hovering stress, as any inversion would be in this case impossible.*
As an example of this, take beyond in X 105

séntĕnce beyond dúst.

The criticism of the doctrine of hovering [illegible] line, ~~the following~~ as follows. It is quite superfluous in explaining the double verse forms mán-kīnd and mān-kínd, and analogous forms, and even compounds of the nature of ān-[illegible]. [illegible] of word-prose stress takes with the greatest ease, at the suggestion of the environment, ascending or descending rhythm as required.

[illegible] stress will not however explain [illegible] possessing a minor stress on -tom, is be[illegible] as an iamb; (or, likewise, how beyónd can

[illegible]

stress on -tom (or bo-), even though only slightly overweighing the other stress, would give to the word a ludicrously abnormal form; and yet this is what hovering stress demands. Indeed Schipper agrees with Masson [illegible]

Bound áfter thém to thé |bottóm|less pít

is too horrible; and such barbarous readings are imaginary." And yet Schipper's scansion [illegible] the same thing, in order [illegible] even upon the principle of hovering [illegible] of bottom, the first syllable must preponderate, however little, over the [illegible]

We shall see hereafter that the only satisfactory [illegible] in such a case is to let the (expiratory) spoken accent remain unaltered on its proper syllable, [illegible]

Mr. Masson in the introduction to his [illegible] of John Milton, London 1874, also [illegible] in regard to (1), (2), and (3). [illegible]

After scanning the first twenty-nine [illegible] lines the iambus is absent from the second place and we have a pyrrhic, a trochee, a spondee, or even an anapest, or an [illegible]."

"A study of the facts proves [illegible] right by declaring that English blank verse admits a trochee, a spondee, or a pyrrhic for the iamb in almost any place of the line.

"Less numerous than the lines that depart from the strict 5×a [= 5 iamb] formula by the substitution of the trochee, the pyrrhic, or the spondee, for the iambus, but still very [illegible]

an the line which it appears in [illegible]
[illegible] substitution of one trisyllabic, [illegible]
This occasions even a greater irregularity in appearance; for wherever an anapest, a dac-[illegible]
displaces an iambus, the line, of course, is [illegible] syllables. [illegible] the trisyllabic variation consists with the genius of English blank verse, and imparts to it an additional power and freedom. ----

All these lines might be rectified into deca-[illegible] by supposing elisions, [illegible] contracted utterances; and there are some [illegible] There could be no more absurd error. ----

Are there any examples of two trisyllabic variations in one line? There are, though exceedingly rare."

Though five beats or accents are the [illegible]

maximum of [illegible], yet he [illegible] the [illegible] of accents, unless in a peculiar scheme of accent not realized in actual pronunciation [the [illegible] to be counted], [illegible]. In a good many of the lines [in a list he has just given] only four distinct accents can be counted. In three lines, I can detect but three; and, on the other hand, in a few spondaic lines the number seems to mount to six, seven, or even eight.

Thus we see that Masson (1) lets the number of syllables exceed ten, (2) varies widely the number of stresses in a line, and (3) admits [illegible] and non-caesural [illegible] [and (4) [illegible]] [illegible].

Mr. [illegible], [illegible] in his [illegible] of [illegible], [illegible]

[illegible] (1889), [illegible] in a paper read before the English Philological Society in June 1876 and published in their Transactions, are not quite so free as Mr. Masson's, and yet admit licenses as equal feet. [illegible] is speaking about blank verse in general, not, [illegible] Masson, only of Milton's.

In regard (1) to the number of syllables in the verse, he admits [illegible] admits doubly stressed or unstressed feet, thus either raising or lowering the number of stresses from the five stresses of the type line.

(3) The occurrence of trochaic substitution is limited by these two sentences of 18[illegible] and 1869, which, as Mr. Mayor points out, do not exactly agree. (1848) "It is necessary that there should be an accent on the last syllable, either

of the third and fifth measure, or of the second and fourth. If either of these requisitions is complied with, other accents may be distributed at pleasure."

(1564) "There must be a principal stress on the last syllable of the second and fourth measures; or of the first and fourth; or of the third and [illegible]. If [illegible] one of these three conditions is complied [illegible], the verse so far as stress is concerned is complete."

That is, he considers iambs are necessary only [illegible]

* [illegible]

We see at a glance at the above table that he [illegible] inversion. He allows also non-caesural inversion. It is to be noticed however that he does not go so far as to admit a double trochee [illegible] line.

Let Mr. Mayor, from his Chapters on English Metre [illegible] three heads. He too, like Ellis, is considering blank verse in general, not Milton's especially. (1) Supernumerary syllables he admits but he limits them saying, "As to trisyllabic substitution, it is plain that if we set no limits to this, the character of the metre is changed. ------ I think the limit of trisyllabic substitution is three out of five [feet]"

"We must distinguish, however, between the different kinds of trisyllabic feet. [illegible]

anapest, which may be considered an extension
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]
Whether amphibrachs, i.e. [illegible]
[illegible]
piece, except, of course, cases of feminine
rythm, is perhaps doubtful. I cannot re-
member any parallel to a heroic line [illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]
[in which the first foot is an amphibrach]

"I have no doubt that we must recognize
the substitution of tribrachs for iambs in

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] a tribach [illegible]

[illegible].

(1) "With [illegible]

this, excess of accent, i.e. spondee, is allowed in any position, and I am inclined to think that — — there might be four spondees in one line, supposing that the fourth or fifth foot remains iambic". So we can have a pentameter with nine verse stresses!

Deficiency of accent, the pyrrhic [and we have already seen that he admits the tribrach ⏑ ⏑ ⏑], may also be found in any position, but it is [illegible] to some [illegible], [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]" [illegible] a pentameter need have only four, or even as few as three, verse stresses!

(3) I should be inclined to say that the amount of trochaic substitution was three out of ten, [illegible] (S?) [illegible] otherwise two out of five." Thus we get not only two but three successive trochees; also final and non-casual trochees. <

Add from page opp. 12.

In Abbott and Seeley's English Lessons for English People, London 1871, the authors, in a chapter on modern English metre in general, say in regard to (1) "As a general rule it may be stated that the modern blank verse is, for the most part, more strict than that of Milton, and Milton is more strict than Shakspere, in limiting himself to ten syllables in a line. Milton uses capital, [illegible] as trisyllabic feet." Frequently however unac- [illegible]

vowel is often elided in Milton."

(2) Defect of accent is not allowed, for a syllable unaccented in prose may take, when falling in the arsis position, a verse stress; thus

Nor served it to relax their serried files.

Similarly excess of accent is not allowed, for a syllable, heavily stressed in prose, may, when standing in the thesis position, take no verse stress; thus,

With head, hands, wings, or feet pursues his way;

where hands, wings, though equally and heavily stressed in prose, [illegible] but one stress.

Further, as a consequence of the two licenses above, it may happen that a [illegible] comes upon a heavy thesis of the preceding foot; thus, [illegible] in prose combination, [illegible]. This "sequence", in the English Lessons described as being "so common in our best poets", Mr.

Abbott had frequently found [illegible], [illegible] Shakespearian Grammar, 2nd ed., London 1870, to obviate in a very violent manner, by considering the heavy thesis to have become "[illegible]" or else dissyllabic, and thus to fill at once the place of the preceding arsis and of itself, causing the syllable which might have stood as the light arsis to become a thesis, thus in the Grammar not,

Your breath | first kind|led the | dead coal | of wars

but,

Your breath | first kindled | the dead | coal of | wars.

This will be seen to be, like trochaic substitution, an inversion, for *the dead* is changed to *the dead*, that is, arsis and thesis change places; but unlike trochaic substitution, this is a change in position of an arsis with the following, not the preceding, thesis.

It is well that Mr. Abbott has seen fit to

give this principle up; and yet, without it, and having announced in the English Pros- [illegible] "[illegible] syllable of a word, must fall on the principal [illegible]" [illegible]

X [illegible] dust and nature's law, [illegible] course it must do, in spite of Abbott's just quoted rule), or to make the extraordinary kind of backward inversion described above.

[illegible] As to restriction of trochaic substitution, Abbott and Seeley say "It may be laid down as a rule that in iambic metre one trochee cannot follow another. It is usual to quote as an exception,

Univérsal repróach far wórse to beár" [So

printed, but plainly from the context an accent mark should have been placed also on the first syllable of *universal*, thus making the two trochees referred to, *úniversál*.]

"Such a line, they continue, would be a monstrosity, and it is far more likely that Milton pronounced the word *universal*, he being influenced by the fact that the *i* is long in Latin."

Earlier in the "Grammar" Abbott seems to think two successive trochees, though questionable, yet probable; and indeed there he cites:

Úniversál | reproach | far worse | to bear.

Trochaic substitution in the final foot I do not find mentioned in the English Lessons. It is referred to in the "Grammar".

That at least a slight pause is required before trochaic substitution, is directly stated in the English Lessons. It is

[illegible] lay it down as a rule that a trochee in the middle of a verse must not follow an unemphatic accent [the [illegible]] [illegible].

[illegible] emphatic [illegible], because the emphatic word [illegible] [illegible] two accents. [illegible]

But in this happiness [illegible]

Nevertheless the following seem to be un-[illegible]:

[illegible]

[illegible] [illegible], from the [illegible] [illegible]
He is the man that wrote and said [illegible]
[illegible] with [illegible], that the metrical accent;
"if it fall on any syllable in a word, must
fall on the principal word-accent", makes
it impossible for the authors to use the
syllables -tom and -tain (figure is [illegible]

The insufficiency of current views upon
the nature of [illegible], and specifically of
historic [illegible], as illustrated in the
above [illegible], justifies the belief [illegible] the
following pages.

Part I Syllabification

We have already seen that in Milton's epic verse we are to expect but ten syllables, with occasionally an eleventh, a final syllable in the feminine ending. This expectation, however, seems frequently not to be satisfied by the poet, for we often have to come on words whose syllabic division would give us one or more extra syllables. These superfluous syllables may and must be removed by slurring, syncopation, etc. It will be shown that this removal is a far less violent operation that it is usually considered.

(A) Syllabification within a Word

(a) Diphthongs and Hiatus

The boundary between two contiguous vowels is the point of least intensity. This point is sometimes emphasized by

naming the sounds as in the combination [illegible]. [illegible] method of [illegible]. At times, however, it is a matter of choice as to whether any such separating point shall exist or not. Thus in the combination *ia*, if we let a decrease in sonority come at the end of the *i* ([illegible] the end of the *i*; [illegible] before [illegible], we get two syllables. If [illegible] crease in sonority is made, but we pass [illegible] sonorous *i* to the more sonorous *a*, [illegible] like *ja*. Thus by but very slightly varying the method of production of the *i*, we may get at will one or two [illegible]

Accordingly the two verse phrases béauty-tóne, and béauty and íll, consist equally of three syllables apiece.

Elision is evidently not a proper name for this phenomenon. Even the word slur suggests that the operation is a license or makeshift, which it is not. It is simply the leaning, so to speak, of a less sonorous in a more sonorous element, in the place of preserving a somewhat careful and conscious separation between the two; that is, it is the mono-syllabification into a diphthong of two contiguous [illegible] which would otherwise stand disyllabically in [illegible].

Milton treats [illegible] at times as dissyllabic, at times as a monosyllable. His usage is now to be pointed out more exactly.

1) A stressed vowel or diphthong + a

Hiatus. This combination is constantly treated as dissyllabic: fe-alty, idé-a, le-al, be-ast, unagrée-able, di-adem, Mo-ab, voy-age, Ba-alim (cf. Balaam under next section), etc. Important among this class are proper names in -a-a, -e-a, -ea: [illegible], Aegé-an, Tarpé-an.

Slurring. [illegible] is creature, which is always two, not three, syl-

märes lables. It is probable that this is only an orthographic exception, and that for Milton as for us the ea of this word was a monophthong, not a diphthong.

[illegible] treatment: diamond, Messiah, trial. The last two treat the ia regularly as two syllables. But we have Messiah in XII 244, and trial in I 366. In diamond on the contrary the monosyllabic use of ia outweighs

dissyllabic, and we have di-amond in III 506 and V 634, but diamond in IV 554, V 759, and VI 364.

(2) a + a vowel under primary or secondary stress.

Hiatus. a remains possible in a vowel bearing primary stress: La-értes, a-érial. Here the a does not unite with the following vowel to form a monosyllable, because an initial syllable is peculiarly stable. No such reason however explains why the two a's remain separate in Senna-ar. But such is the case and the word is scanned Sénnaar: transfer to / Exception

Slurring. In Balaàm, Canaàn, Canaànite, Isaàc, Israèl, the contiguous vowels form a monosyllable and remain in the thesis, the latent power of the secondary stress to form an arsis not being utilized. Were this possible use made of the secondary stress, the vowels would remain distinct as in Senna-ar above; and

indeed [illegible] *used* is [illegible] used in [illegible] the [illegible].

Varying Usage. In *Abraham* the *h* is generally weakened and the two *a's* form one syllable. In XII 152 however they form two syllables. *Michael* and *Raphael* similarly vary between two and three syllables. The arbitrariness of Milton's usage is shown by the scansion of the name *Michael* at the beginning and end of the following lines, parts of the line where if anywhere one might expect regularity of usage to be observed.

[illegible] *Of thunder* and the sword of Michael [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 4

[illegible]

Contrast VI 411,

[illegible]

XI 94 Míchael, this my behést have thóu in chárge.

In each of these lines we have trochaic substitution in the first foot, in the second line [illegible] the first running on to form the first part of the following iamb.

(3) Accented vowel or diphthong + e.

Hiatus. The e is regularly in hiatus with the tonic vowel and forms a separate syllable: Be-ersaba, se-er, ve-hement (where the h in itself is strong enough to keep the vowels apart), high-est, qui-et, imbow-ed, tow-er, pro-em, cru-el, etc.

Slurring. [illegible] Expir-

[illegible] in VIII 216 form but one syllable.

Varying usage. Compare with earlier [illegible] following words which show variation in

their syllabication: [illegible] e.g. vari-

-ety in VII 542, but vari-e-ty in VI 640; soci-ety in VIII 383, Among unequals what society,

society in IX 249,

For solitude sometimes is best society;

further piety and pi-ety; generally high-er and high-est, but also higher and highest; generally hi-erarch, but V 591,

Of [illegible] of orders, and degrees,

These are all the words [illegible] of accented vowel or diph[illegible] vary in their syllabication.

(4) e + vowel under primary or secondary [illegible]

Hiatus. E appears before primary accent in these words: be-átitude, Be-élzebub, Cle-óm-brotus, cre-áte (and its similarly accented derivatives), pre-ámble, re-[illegible]. The initial syllable always being particularly [illegible], the e maintains an independent [illegible]

Transp.

Briareòs, [illegible], Paruas, [illegible], and oceànt would seem to form an exception to what we shall presently see to be the usual treatment of the combination e + accented vowel, namely mono-syllabification; but it is to be noted that the first four of these words are proper names, and these naturally on ac- [illegible]

[illegible] of pronunciation. Each of [illegible] smoothing is a more convenient [illegible] -ate form than mono-syllabification [illegible]

[*1]

[illegible] 3

followed by a syllable of stress less in impor- tance. The secondary stress must then either be used as an arsis, and thus [illegible] not [illegible]

would be an arsis, is required, while the e used is thus prevented from slurring.

Slurring. With the phenomenon [illegible] seen in create, should be compared the [illegible] [illegible] of lineaments. Here the [illegible] the on -ments, which is thus of the two the better available as arsis. It is made possible, therefore, for e to slur with [illegible]

we find that the preponderating usage is that e shall slur with the following accented vowel: atheist, Boreas, allbounteous, Bethlehem (with unsounded h), delineate, gorgeous, Leucothea, meteor (cf. mete-or in section 7), spontaneous, etc.

Varying usage. The only word here is ethereal, which is normally ethereal, but [illegible] V 444 ethere-al

also examples from p 41, — comparison to
" " from p 42 + p 25

also from p 47

(5) Accented vowel or diphthong + i

[illegible]
unmistakably that it shall form two syl-
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible], displaying, and obeying occur [illegible]
[illegible]
together. The great preponderance of the
[illegible]
point to the probability of these words'
[illegible]
impossible.

Varying usage. The words that vary show
[illegible]
[illegible]

almost universally ru-in, [illegible] times, but ruin in I 41, and ruins in II 9[illegible]; similarly fly-ing, but flying twice; [illegible] fly-ing, and flying once. do-ing and do-ings generally, doing in II 162; the noun being [illegible]

its syllabification is of course ambiguous; when not final it behaves contrary to the rule being only once be-ing II 865, to four times being; deity and deities however illustrate the rule, being usually each three syllables; we have deities [illegible] less in VI 157, and deity in IX 885 and XI 114; in V 806 we must slur not the i but the y, [illegible].

(6) i + vowel under primary or secondary stress. Hiatus. The clear rule here being the slurring of the i with the following vowel, instead of sounding in Bri-a[illegible], Qui-[illegible].

Transfer to 5

[illegible], Sy-ene, Thy-[illegible], and [illegible], a[illegible] to be explained by the [illegible] of initial syllables.

Also [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] to the position of theses to the following [illegible] And thus they do not allow the i to slur with the following vowel, but cause it to remain as an [illegible]

The difference between the two sets of examples is to be noted. In the first set Priamos etc., the strength of the initial

syllable retains it as thesis and prevents it from slurring with the following vowel and thus losing its syllabically independent existence. In the second set of examples, Sùsi-ána etc, the strength of the initial syllable retains it as arsis and prevents it from sinking to the rank of [illegible]

i is retained as thesis, and prevented from slurring with the contiguous vowel.

The position of the second~~ary~~ thesis ~~accent~~ in insáti-áble, vári-able, sóciáble, sóci-ábly, etc, [illegible]

[illegible] secondary [illegible]

this fact which determines the position of the second thesis on the a, and prevents

the slurring with the a of the [illegible]

[illegible] as the thesis. / There is no such Empi

reason, however, why Darwin, expiring, [illegible]

[illegible] should not be [illegible]. For the

[illegible] expiring to come in the verse after the

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] In Darwin, expiring, etc, we would expect slurring on account of the common tendency thereto shown by pretonic i, (by pretonic we here mean before secondary as [illegible]. [illegible] occurred, the syllable under secondary would then ~~have~~ with the i have formed the thesis, and a strong syllable would have been then introduced in the [illegible] transfer to 5, where they form [illegible] place by the poet to carry the accent.

There is great wealth of illustration for the sounding of the i: [illegible] [illegible], [illegible], chariot, [illegible], [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], [illegible], [illegible], [illegible] Quintius, saviour, speedier, speediest (with one comparative — the [illegible] of goodlier, see below — that is the constant way of sounding comparatives and superlatives of adjectives and adverbs ending in y), [illegible], [illegible], [illegible], [illegible], [illegible], and many others of which some would seem as most unnatural [illegible] as [illegible], illustrious, stateliest; moreover, Ádiàbéne, [illegible], [illegible], [illegible], [illegible]; further, [illegible], [illegible], [illegible] (the occasion of the [illegible] accent in the same two words is to be noted.)]

transfer to 5, where they forms are pri [illegible]

In Ophiúsa (cf. Ophiuchus above) and Dangéra the tendency to slur the i and the preference [illegible] o in initial syllable are in conflict. Initial strength we found victorious in Ophi-uchus, Ethi-opian, etc; but in Ophiúsa and Dangéra the tendency to slur gets the upper hand and the initial syllable is used as the [illegible]

-Ate seems to be a rather weak ending, for it is not raised to the arsis in such words as associàte, immediàte, infuriàte, irradiàte, satiàte, etc. We are not therefore surprised to find the past ending -ed and the adverbial ly becoming the arsis rather than -ate, as in vìtiatèd (cf. however vi-o- [illegible]. [illegible] the scansion of immediately in XI 477. [illegible] immédiately a piece, immédiately [illegible]

but the only possible [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] of the [illegible] [illegible] to the [illegible]. Similarly [illegible] is [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]. [illegible] [illegible] the right of bearing the arms to the [illegible] strong [illegible] of the ruling [illegible], or [illegible] [illegible] [illegible].

Passing [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] that [illegible] forms [illegible] [illegible] down to the [illegible] an [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible].

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] though [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] l'angin naive [illegible]

[illegible]

We have [illegible] in I [illegible], and [illegible] [illegible] at XII 240. The first shows the [illegible] [illegible] which retains the [illegible] as arsis. The second illustrates the [illegible] in [illegible] of i, and the consequent [illegible] of the initial syllable from arsis to thesis.

In I 112 we have the adjective suppliant. In X 917 there occurs the noun suppli-ant. [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] syllabification is due to the different grammatical use. It is more probable that the final position of the latter word caused [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] ble. It would seem to be due to the rhythmically stricter and more [illegible] [illegible] utterance which is proper [illegible]

end of the line. Metricians are accustomed to find fault with a line ending in an arsis which in prose utterance is less emphatic than the preceding (fourth) [illegible] line. This condemnation would cover all lines ending in a trisyllable in which the primary stress forms the fourth, and the secondary [illegible] the [illegible] such endings namely as ob-é-dience, sup-pli-ánt, Mícha-él, etc. Such metricians do not recognize the truth that arses do not differ among themselves in glory, however much may differ the accenting of the syllables in the [illegible] out of which the arses are made.

(7) Accented vowel or diphthong + c

Hiatus. The two vowels are uniformly kept apart: cha-os; Nebai-oth; Galilé-o, meté-orous (cf meteòr under 4),

[illegible]

see the [illegible] used as [illegible] the [illegible]
of [illegible], just the reverse of the usage in
[illegible] under section 6. The difference
shows what a variety of conditions one
[illegible]

(8) *c* + vowel [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible] not take place are Chro-mí-um, and
Ǽ-o-li. The first of these is explained by
the power of the initial syllable to resist
mono-syllabification, and to preserve its [illegible]. The second example is anomalous. We
should expect from the syllabification
of Samoà and Meroè, to have [illegible]
scanned [illegible].

Varying usage is not found.

(9) Accented vowel or diphthong + u (or ou).

Hiatus is here constant in the [illegible] [illegible] : [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible]-us, Ly-cá-us, trí-umph; and with
ou, pí-ous.

(10) u + vowel under primary or secondary
stress.

Hiatus. In sánctuáry, insínuati[illegible]

and sítuátion, if the u were [illegible], the [illegible] second arsis would have to pass to a syllable of less importance than that on which it stands now, and the [illegible] ation is therefore observed. In [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] cause it is one of the few adjective past participles of verbs ending in t or d which shorten the double dental combination ted or ded to a simple dental. It would perhaps, therefore, not be unreasonable to see a peculiar propriety in keeping the [illegible] sition of arsis, rather than [illegible]

Exception [illegible]

sink to thesis, as it would have to [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] the importance of its initial position, remains as a separate element and forms the thesis.

Slurring. The regular usage is illustrated by the following words: *assiduous*, [illegible]

A slurred *u* in the initial syllable is to be seen in *puissance, puissant*, — a [illegible] *u* [illegible] above mentioned in *fru-ition*, in which word the heavier consonant combination *fr* helps, in addition to the initial position of the syllable, to keep the *u* [illegible]

separate syllable from the preceding vowel.)

Varying usage. In influence the u [illegible] -ence, and twice sings with it. Possibly the u is kept so often in a separate syllable by the double consonant preceding it, for if it is sung in the second syllable, the word starts off with the heavy consonant combination flu. Superfluous, on the other hand, inclines strangely enough to the other method of syllabification, being three times used in the form su-pér-fluoùs and only once, II 832, as su-pér-flu-oùs. Perhaps we may represent the [illegible] of the two words thus:

in-flu-ence

but su-pérf-luoùs, the difference being due to the different combination of the f.

Five times spiritual forms but two

[illegible]

Some-times it forms three syllables. It is ~~perhaps~~ impossible to say in the latter [illegible] or spiritual, for it is as genuinely [illegible] use -ual. The trisyllabic occurrences are initial in IV 585, V 406, XII 531; medial in V 573.

(11) Other diphthongs and triphthongs.

The combinations -ower and -our are triphthongal in nature, due to a vocalic [illegible] never breaks up into two syllables save exceptionally in the case of flower and power. Some of these words are tower [illegible] too, are always monosyllabic except in [illegible]

[illegible] pinned under 3 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] tion, due to the great preponderance of masculine endings, a word of ambiguous form is best considered monosyllabic.

Similarly we have diphthongs and triphthongs, not dissyllabic hiatus, in [illegible] [illegible] which occurs only once and then finally is from its position probably a monosyllable.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

an, if scanned as one [illegible] with inversion [illegible] initial foot, and leaves us to the [illegible] [illegible] of to-ward(s). But VI 645

Then cóming tó-wards them so dread they seem, shows the accent, with which agree also IX 499 and XII 296.

It seems possible to detect the following principles in the above phenomena:

1st A stressed vowel or diphthong + unstressed vowel = two syllables: Ré-al, Mó-ab; bé-er, quí-et, crú-el; Hebrá-ic, [illegible]-ic; chá-os, Sabá-oth, Lé-o; Imá-us, Lycé-u.

2nd An unstressed vowel + a vowel under primary or (more generally) secondary stress = one syllable: Isaàc, Israèl; atheìst, [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], [illegible].

That is to say, 1st the less important

[illegible]
when following the more important vowel;
[illegible]
[illegible]

The most important [illegible]
to the [illegible] of these [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
vocalic combination follows the more
important part, and yet they are almost
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] part of the [illegible] may be represented
by the three words midi-aron-ámile,
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
becoming [illegible] for the [illegible]

a place in arsis, and preserves it from [illegible] in the weak position, a change which would be required if the i were to slur with the [illegible]. In the second word similarly, and yet with a difference, initial imperfection [illegible] the disappearance of the i as a syllable [illegible] ing a thesis, and its com- [illegible] the following [illegible] [illegible], [illegible] would necessitate the imposition of the arsis on the ending -ble which is not as well fitted for that purpose as the -a- [illegible]

(3) So-called Syncopation

1 Real syncopation, the actual cutting out of a sound from a word as the change of [illegible] — [illegible] [illegible] endings -ist and -ed, an exceedingly [illegible] occurrence in Paradise Lost. [illegible]

[illegible] is often called syncopation, but which [illegible] in another matter, [illegible] the use of bordering, [illegible] word. The explanation would seem to be this: the pronunciation of border is, when the r is not weakened [illegible] out of existence into a mere ə, [illegible] When a vocalic ending, such as ing, for instance, is added to such a word, the [illegible] (but not bor-der-ing), or the r may lose its sonantic function and become consonantal, and then we get the pronunciation bor-dring. This is exactly parallel to the change of the nature of l in the two metrical phrases dú-bi-ous and dú-bious-ly. It is evident that [illegible]

[illegible]

II A a omit this

+ Then put II × with 2 [illegible] (except blue brackets

[illegible]

Then II B b with Brand [illegible] 2 %

[illegible]

[illegible] a name which, however, we re-tain in this connection, as it has the [illegible] [illegible].

2. The [illegible] [illegible] its syllabic quality part of the preceding syllable. Of this there are two types, ~~which are differentiated on page~~ 81:

1st [illegible]; heavy > heavn.

2nd [illegible] [illegible] shun

[illegible].

[illegible] tween the tonic vowel and the liquid or nasal must be any sonorant and thus either itself a liquid or a nasal, or else a voiced continuant; otherwise it would break the word in two,

and always preserve it in [illegible]
With voiced continuants we have reas-n and
ev-l > reasn and evl, though their usual
[illegible].

[illegible]

+ anteriority p81

[illegible]

We have now to examine the [illegible] cases.

(1) Tonic syllable + middle vowel + final syllable beginning with l.

Unsyncopated forms are frequent: Sofala, vassalage, marvelling, family,

deso-rate fraudu-lent, re[illegible]

[illegible]

IX 644; in Paradise Regained II 166 it is unsyncopated), [illegible], pendulous, populous, credulous (in IX 644 but unsyncopated in Paradise Regained II 166). It is to be noted that the middle vowel u can hardly be supposed to have had its present diphthongal value.

[illegible] devilish is that by the addition of the ending ish to the word devil̥, the l̥ becomes consonantal and we get dev-lish. In just the same way when we add -ing to fable̥ we get fab-ling. The spelling [illegible]

than it [illegible] is necessary to explain why [illegible] + ing gives a dissyllable, as it is to explain why devil + ish gives only a dissyllable. But the phenomena are [illegible].

When we add the [illegible] of [illegible]tives from words in -ble, it [illegible] [illegible] rule over the unmixed.

Varying usage is found in furious which is once dissyllabic (I 276) and once trisyllabic (II 420). We have orbicular in X 381 but orbic-lar in III 718. Populous [illegible] against its twice unsyncopated form (I. 403, VII 146). With this last word we should compare popular, which, as we have seen above, is always (four times) syncopated.

(2) We might expect syllabic l to

[illegible] as [illegible] neither [illegible] combines with the preceding syllable, as we have seen it under (1) often combine with the following syllable. [illegible] away giving devl in X 878, but this is an exception, the normal form being dissyllabic. Similarly evil is monosyllabic a number of times, but in the great majority of instances it is [illegible] dissyllabic.

U k 78 / both [illegible] normal form from which the i starts is syllabic, not the consonant of the suffix -il. Syncopation might be expected also in such a word as mortality (in which the i starts out as consonantal [illegible] its becoming mortal-ty and then mortalty. Such indeed does not happen, but if it did it would be [illegible], because

[illegible]
which gives us spirit and [illegible], [illegible] ion is restricted to these two [illegible] pining universally such forms as [illegible] civil-ity, mil-itant, pol-icy, vol-ume; [illegible]

(3) [illegible]

[illegible]

enables us to decide between the two possible scansions in IX 444 and IX 905, and we must read

So spake the en-e-my of mankind, enclosed,

[illegible]

[illegible]

(4) m does not occur in a [illegible] similar to that of l in evil.

p. 75 M not infrequently occurs in a position similar to that of r in flourishing, but it never becomes syllabic [illegible] along with the succeeding syllable. Thus [illegible], [illegible], already cited under the end of section 3.

(5) Tonic syllable + middle vowel + [illegible] ending with another m.

Here each method of scansion is [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Syncopation is shown by the ve[illegible] [illegible]ge class of present participles of verbs in -en as betokening, chastening, [illegible] etc; further by covenant, bituminous business, reasoning, resonant, unreasonable.

The words that va[illegible]

[illegible]

ais in its one occurrence is [illegible]); Lúmi-nòus III 420, luminous VIII 140. We [illegible]

forms. This is supported by VII 38.7;

With their bright [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] : m[illegible] ; [illegible]

can-opy, in-nocent, etc.

Words like fallen, barren, where the n is usually vocalic, at times slur, at times do not. The usage is as follows:

l-n slurs regularly ln: befallen, fallen, stolen, swoln. The one exception is the dissyllabic sullen

r-n occurs ~~only~~ once i.e. in barren, and here it does not slur, thus barren. It

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

syllabify with the initial vowel of the fol-
lowing word. But [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

graven, given, [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]
dissyllabic, though it is slurred in VI 544;
[illegible]
twice, VI 738 and VII 185. It is ambiguous
[illegible]
it is also in III 677, which may be [illegible]
Who jústly hath drív-en out his rébel [illegible]
or, Who jústly háth driv'n out his rébel fóes.
Heaven, simply and in compounds, is regularly slurred. Not very unusually, however, it is treated as dissyllabic. There is also a question as to how heavenly + vowel is to be scanned. For example shall we scan
I 138, As fár as góds and héavenly | éssencés,
or, [illegible] ?
[illegible]
[illegible]
hiatus as -ly | essences, would point to the first scansion as [illegible]. The other

lines in which the same question arises are VIII 453, and X 641. In XI 871 each of the slurrings takes place,

As present, heavenly instructer, I revive

-en in certain words, however, does not [illegible]: [illegible], [illegible], [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] of [illegible]. [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], he does not change wov-n to wovn, but takes the license of making a past participle in the [illegible] form and

III 352 Their crowns in-wove with amarant and gold.

In -ing the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]: [illegible], [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], [illegible]. [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

prison in I 71, and VI 660; and [illegible] in I 245, VIII 591, and IX 559. Heaven is equally divided, being dissyllabic in I 8 and II 183, and monosyllabic in I 314 and IV 641. The rather frequently occurring word [illegible] [illegible] contrary to the [illegible] [illegible], being slurred throughout Paradise Lost; though once in Paradise Regained it occurs as a dissyllable, II 127.

(7) [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

serve-ries, cormo-rant, favou-rite, [illegible] be expected when the syllable following the _e_ is not a [illegible]

Transfer to p. [illegible]

+ cf with Tiresias

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] to be expected however

when [illegible] is followed by a

[illegible] ([illegible]

[illegible]) [illegible].

But otherwise we may expect slur

[illegible]: barbarous, nectarous (cf nectar-ine

where the final syllable is too strong to

sink to the Thesis), answering, [illegible]

(to be expected rather than messe-ng [illegible]),

[illegible], considerate (to be expected rather

than [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible],

honours, savouring, adventurous, for

[illegible]

[illegible]

The number of words here is not inconsiderable. We shall notice the [illegible]

[illegible]

Conqueror twice ; but conque-ror I 323,
and conque-rors XI 695.

dangerous generally ; dange-rous II 107

desperate II 107 ; despe-rate III 85

different generally ; diffe-rent I 636, IX 88[illegible]

emperor twice ; empe-ror II 510

[illegible]

[illegible] slurring should be prevented by the [illegible] suitability of the syllable -a, than that of -ble, for carrying the arsis

* liberal IX 996 ; libe-ral twice.

mineral I 235 ; mine-ral VI 517

numerous generally ; nume-rous XI 13[illegible]

pondering generally ; ponde-ring "

prosperous II 254 ; prosp-e-rous XI 364.

[It is interesting to compare these two occur-
rences. The first is in the body of the
line: [illegible].
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]]

reverence generally; reve-rence VIII 544

* [illegible]
[illegible]

temperance generally; tempe-rance XII 5[illegible]

amorous generally; amo-rous IV 311, VIII 477, [illegible]
IX 1015

dolorous twice ; dolo-rous II 519

[illegible]

natural generally; natu-ral X 765

sulphurous twice; *sulphu-rous* VI 512.
The only words in which the unslurred outnumber the slurred forms, are marked thus ※. Of them, we have *liberal* once to *libe-ral* twice; and *reverent* not at all in Paradise Lost and only once in Paradise Regained, to *rev-erent* thrice in Paradise Lost.

(8) to P77 We have already noticed under the end of section two, that in only two words does a sound capable of becoming syllabic, standing immediately after the accented vowel and before an unstressed vowel, absorb this unstressed vowel by becoming itself syllabic and then by losing its syllabic nature again, reduce by one the number of syllables in the word. The words [illegible]

ing. To these we must add authority. The process is thus: -irt, -oursh-, ort-, give -irrt, -ourrsh-, -orrt-, which are then trisyllabic forms but which are further reduced to -irrt, -ourrsh-, -orrt, where the r probably remains [illegible]. This development takes place in flourishing in the only occurrence, Paradise Regained III 80. Authority occurs a number of times, and this reduction takes place only once, and for this word, too, in Paradise Regained, in II 5. This reduction seems, then, to be a later development of Milton's syllabification. In spirit, on the other hand, it is not uncommon even from the beginning of Paradise Lost. The development takes place about thirty times out of a hundred, or one out of three. In spirit

spir-itùàl, spur-iòus, the secondary accent is utilized as an arsis, and slurring, accordingly, does not take place.

In words in which a similar development to the above might be expected, it does not take place. So we have car-avan, cher-ishing, me[illegible] glorify, etc. cf. pp 64, 65, 66, 73

A different type is represented by the word cover = covr̥. Here the r̥ is already syllabic. We have seen that n under like conditions not infrequently slurred. But r̥ does not easily amalgamate with the preceding syllable. And thus we have [illegible] [illegible] póvr̥tỳ, rivr̥s. Indeed it seems that for r̥ we have only one example of this slurring, namely evr in III 244. Generally of course evr̥ is dissyllabic.

At first sight we might think that we find examples of this kind of spelling in pillar II 302, XII 202, XII 203; whether in X 57, XI 296; savour X 269; river III 358; but we find, as an alternative con-dition, that in each of these cases the following word begins with a vowel, and so when [illegible] [illegible] the syllables joined, it would unite with the following, not the preceding, syllable.

from p 78

We are taught to regard the interchange of the syllable and the corresponding use of vowels and [illegible] as [illegible] [illegible] the interchange of the uses of i, u, and even of the other vowels, as they form on the one hand a syllable themselves, or enter on the other

into slighter combination with a more heavily stressed vowel. Does the statement of the [illegible] [illegible] hold good in the above phenomena of the weak and [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] concerning the behaviour of the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] of IXI, p. 56. [illegible] [illegible], as I have said above.

We considered the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] of [illegible] 1st at the less important [illegible] position at the more heavily stressed [illegible]; 2nd next preceding it. And we found that in the first case [illegible], in the 2nd case, slurring was the rule. There were some [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] of which could be [illegible].

Similarly we [illegible] [illegible]

labic liquids and nasals I, as they fol[illegible] vowel, and (II) as they preceded the more strongly stressed element, the vowel.

I has two sub-types: (a) In a very few words r [illegible] by lengthening the unstressed post-tonic vowel from the fore, and then slurring to its place. Thus spirit, flourishing, au-thority > spi[illegible], flou[illegible], [illegible] > spirit, flourrishing, au-thority.

(b) Generally however the syllabic liquid or nasal has made a conquest of the post-tonic unstressed vowel from the rear, and we have devil, reason, ever etc > devl̥, reazn̥, evr̥ etc. Here normally slurring does not

[illegible]

in syllabic. Now this is exactly parallel to the 1st law concerning the treatment of vowels in contact.

II Syllables [illegible], and [illegible] before a more strongly stressed element, [illegible]. It is not to be expected of course that (the development and) slurring of sequence [illegible] [illegible]. It is true, nevertheless, that just as we find Uriel in preponderance over Uri-el, [illegible] we expect numerous to appear more frequently than nume-rous.

That is to say, there is a tendency observable in the behavior of persons

[illegible]
is confined to the 2nd [illegible]
[illegible]

Summing up [illegible] the following.

For I (a) nothing more need be said.

For I (b):

v-i̥ regularly does not slur

There is no example of consonant + n̥.

r-n̥, y-n̥ do not slur

v-n̥ inclines to vn, often remaining however as v-n̥.

i-n̥ gives i̯n [The mono-syllabic era [illegible] i̯n, i̯n, ~~[illegible]~~ which is con[illegible] to the [illegible] rule, finds an [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] behavior of vowels in contact, [illegible]

as mono-syllabic]

r l,i, thr do not slur

vr is generally unslurred; slur [illegible]

[illegible]

II. In present participles of verbs ending in r, n, l, as wither, charm[illegible]n, [illegible], we always have slurring: [illegible] [illegible], [illegible], [illegible]. [illegible] example of the slurring of m, thus [illegible]-ment represents the regular form. In other combinations there is a tendency towards slurring, but it is often resisted by the strength of the ending, which when heavy naturally has a strong tendency to the accent position. This explains the difference between [illegible] and [illegible]; between uttering and útterable. / In [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible].

[illegible] this note to
[illegible]

p47

measured form is naturally chosen: Tha-my-ris, Ze-phy-rus, Tanta-lus, Ta-pró-bă-né, etc. At other times, and frequently, the choice between the full and the slurred form seems to be arbitrary.

Note. It has been remarked above that there is a tendency, [illegible]

[illegible]

Thus: effeminate [illegible]

generate [illegible]

exasperate [illegible]

dolo-rous [illegible]

We have suggested that perhaps the [illegible]

[illegible]

of the verse. It must be understood that by the end of the verse is here meant the fourth and [illegible] of the fifth foot [illegible] for of course there would be no possi-bility [illegible], for temperare to stand in the fifth foot. But the tendency above commented on is that temperare will not even stand in the arsis of the fourth and the thesis of the fifth foot; but ~~that~~ if the first syllable of this word stands as the arsis of the fourth foot, the rest of it will show its fuller, un[illegible] form, and fill both the thesis and the arsis of the fifth foot, becoming *témpe-ráre*

(γ) The Syncopation

As remarked at the beginning of [illegible]

the phenomenon which we have been discussing is not true syncopation. Cf. Then we have a few [illegible] syncopated appearing [illegible] the root of a word. [illegible] in verbal endings it is regular. The most important [illegible] are in capitol in II 624, XI 393, and XII 312 (capitol occurs once in its full form in I 756); and once in Cap(i)toline IX 508. No other [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], without capitol ([illegible]), [illegible], difficult, etc.

The second person singular ending -est is regularly syncopated both in the present and in the preterite.

So also is the preterite and the past participial ending -ed, save in [illegible]

. Is this preference due to a possible
[illegible]
[illegible]?

whose stems end in d or t. There are a goodly number of exceptions to the syncopation of -ed, and we have not infrequently [illegible], [illegible], [illegible], [illegible], etc. When the adverbial ending -ly is added to a past participle, the fuller form seems to have been preferred by Milton. If syncopation were to take place there, it would result in ~~a [illegible]~~ [illegible] uncertainty as to [illegible]; and hence the "[illegible]" [illegible], when ed is [illegible] unsyncopated (except after t and d), the full form is preserved before -ly. Thus [illegible] P. Lost, I 401, [illegible]; and similarly in P. Regained IV 133. We must therefore read P. Lost, II 414, thus,

[illegible]

We have, on the other hand, a few cases in which syncopation of the past participle ending -ed takes place [illegible] after a stem ending in t, with consequent simplification of the double dental: uplift I 193 (cf uplifted I 347, and II 7), unsuspect IX 771, convict X 83; and the words in -ate: elevate II 558, alienate V 877, infatuate VI [illegible], situate IV [illegible], [illegible] [illegible].

B Syllabification between Vowels

The, final i (of the) and -y, are very frequently [illegible] by Milton with a following syllable beginning in a vowel, [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] (cf the [illegible] part of the rules for the scanning of [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] 56, and 79.)

that no [illegible] the [illegible] to the between words is not so great as within a word); but it is perhaps [illegible] say that the exigencies of the metre decide between slurring and hiatus; and we are not to be surprised at finding such a line as XI 345

From all the ends of the earth to celebrate.

Hiatus may be:

(a) within a foot: [illegible] I [illegible],

(b) between feet: [illegible] to heaven I [illegible],

(c) between trochee and iamb:

[illegible] III [illegible].

We may have corresponding slurrings,

(a) into arses: this or the other III [illegible],

(b) into theses of iambs: [illegible] III [illegible]

(c) into theses of trochees: [illegible] III 7[illegible].

The only [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

the -e, -y, and e of the, [illegible]
[illegible] be [illegible]
employed to make the verse rhythmical.

These slurrings are as follows:

(1) the, -y, -ble, slurred before h:

the: I 140, [illegible], II 444, III 560, IV 610, VI 79, VII 32, 377, VIII 45, IX 52, X 204, 684, XI 372, 583.

-y: III [illegible].

-ble: IV [illegible].

(2) the slurred before w: VIII 613 (the way).

(3) Other vocalic endings slurred before vowels:

to: I 323, IV 67, V 271, 360, 383, 576, 614 (into), 677, 725, VI 316, 636, VII 352, IX 648, 992, 1140, 1185, X 110, 334, 467, 486, XI 170, ~~326,~~ 236, 596, XII 437, 444 [illegible].

Other o's: I 470, 584 (morocco), II 450, III 108, V 407 ([illegible]), 628, IX 296 (though), 1082, X 203, XII 61.

-ow: I 558, II 518, III 120, V 575, X 717, 1092, 1104, XI 757, XII 613.

be, thee, me, he, we: I 245, II 703, III 3, IV 758, 939, [illegible]

553, 563, VIII 310, IX 1[illegible], 152, 5[illegible], [illegible], 740, X [illegible],

[illegible], 762, 766, 764, 795, XI 659.

[illegible] (generally of virtue; twice of continue):

II 314 (continue), III 586, IV 371 (continue), [illegible],

[illegible].

Thou: X 121, 758.

Journey: V 559

[illegible]: X 567

I VIII 611

[illegible]: X [illegible]

(4) Other vocalic endings than [illegible], [illegible], [illegible] slurred before [illegible]:

to: I [illegible], II [illegible],

909, IX 1153, X 12, 544, XI 453.

[illegible]: [illegible].

[illegible]: [illegible] 649.

[illegible]: [illegible].

(5) Syllabic nasal and liquid slurred before vowels.

[illegible]: IX 764 (eaten), IX 1025 (forbidden), X 116 ([illegible]),

X 9[illegible] ([illegible]).

ú: II 302 and XII 202 and 203 (pillar), III 358 ([illegible]),
VIII 498 (neither), X 269 (savour), X 57 and XI 29 ([illegible])

Remark to Slurring between Words: It is needless to say that it is absolutely essential [illegible] [illegible] extra metric syllables and that the accents may fall properly. There follow a [illegible].

I 202 Cre-at-ed hug-est that swim the ocean stream
II 3[illegible] [illegible]
IV 848 Virtue in her shape how lovely; saw and pin'd
V 407 No ingrateful food; and food alike those pure
VII 446 Of rainbows and starry eyes. The waters thus
VIII 61[illegible] [illegible]
X 198 Because thou hast heark'n'd to the voice of thy wife
X [illegible] [illegible]

add population p 19
in [illegible] p 18, p 109

add ambitious pp 108 + 153
+ humiliation p 144

It will be found, however, that double theses are not always to be obviated as in dieresis. Thus the (initial) double theses in

II 880 With impétu-ous, pp108 + 133
III 36 And Tirési-as, 151
V 413 And Corpóre-al, 108 + 133

as well as the interior double theses in

I 746 On Lemnos, the Aegé-an, as well as a few others, have to be obviated [illegible] [illegible] by a change of accent in the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], accompanied by slurring, but [illegible] [illegible] the word. All these lines will be [illegible] in Vol II

The slurring between words that we have been studying so far, corresponds to the slurring and so-called [illegible] within a word, which we [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] A. Under A we had a few cases of true syncopation as capu(i)tal, see (y) above. That was within a word. Have we anything between words that corresponds to this syncopation? We have, but only three times,—twice in the change of in the to i' th' in I 224 and XI 432, and once in the change of of thy to o' thy in the phrase [illegible] of thy wife X 111; where the syncopation [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] than that we should drop [illegible] from thy with wife.

Concluding Remark to Part I

Thus we see that when we [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] to see the reason for the [illegible] of vowels and vocalic nasals and liquids, and have made very [illegible]

casional syncopations: [illegible], i'th' etc., all the lines are found to have but ten syllables (with occasionally an extra-metric final syllable making a feminine ending), and that these [illegible] are needed for the making of [illegible] feet, [illegible] — [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] syllables which in reality do not exist.

If Milton had meant the vowels, liquids, and nasals which we have discussed above, to [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] tion, that they would not [illegible] combine, by the simplest phonetic principles, to form a diphthongal monosyllable with a contiguous vowel.

[illegible] ; as [illegible]
[illegible] of [illegible]

Cf my Phil. paper on phatic communication

cf pp 109 175

Part II. Accents

From fact that the [illegible] permits all license as to disyllabic anapest, and tribrachs. From this we have no feet. We have [illegible] in general [illegible] the importance of the [illegible] (= [illegible]), the spondee (= [illegible]), and double trochee [illegible] a single trochee in wrong place (= wrong disposition of accent).

Metricians are agreed that the typical pentameter may be represented thus: [illegible], where [illegible] syllable, and no indication is made as to the length of the syllables. But there is a fatal tendency among metricians to [illegible] metrical effects. Briggs says, and [illegible]

would agree with him, that there are only [illegible]

Nor [illegible]

[illegible] find others calling the marked [illegible] foot a pyrrhic, a foot of two unstressed syllables. [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] distinguishing [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

The [illegible]

[illegible]

poetic accents, in the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] have six, and more [illegible] than five in each direction [illegible].

Let us cut the Gordian knot and say that always and without exception a pentameter line that *is* a pentameter must have five stresses, and that these stresses are not always prose stresses, though they generally are. [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] verse stress or ictus, the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] us.

Symbols used in the following treatment: The ictus or verse stress shall be distinguished by ˇ.

Prose accent, both primary and strong secondary, shall be indicated by the accent mark ´, or by — [illegible]

[illegible] — [illegible] in the [illegible] of the sequence, or, pre-[illegible], as to the verse beat. By [illegible] secondary stress is meant that which in a polysyllabic word, which is [illegible] stress, as the first syllable in disobé-dience, or the last in [illegible]. It is not necessary for our metrical discussion of the iambic pentameter to distinguish between the primary and the strong secondary stresses of prose, since they both [illegible] [illegible]. Hence we [illegible] both of them with ´ or —.

When, in scanning, the verse stress coincides with the prose stress, it is not necessary to distinguish between

[illegible] stress, and accordingly either the prose signs ´ and ‾, or the verse sign

✓ may be used.

Prose stress when weak may be indicated by the length ‾ [illegible] [illegible] syllables [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] syllables, etc., [illegible] [illegible] [illegible].

When it is occasionally necessary to mark what shall be called weak secondary prose stress, the mark ` shall be placed over the syllables [illegible] [illegible], [illegible]. [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] always on the syllable [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]. Though the weak secondary accent is not ordinarily observable in prose, due to the fact that it is overshadowed by the strong stress next it (and it may then [illegible]

[illegible] of ac[illegible] [illegible] prove the [illegible]
[illegible] a form which is more [illegible]
[illegible] it is nevertheless [illegible]
[illegible] from the fact that ìn, thè, [illegible]
or ámóng, óthèr, etc, can bear the
[illegible]

A few words will be said later on the nature of verse stress, but thus much must be stated now: the a[illegible] [illegible] absolutely equal in metrical importance, and when discussing ver[illegible] the stand point of metrical structure, it is erroneous to say that one accent is more prominent than another. [illegible] [illegible] down strokes to mark the rhythmical [illegible] by accented notes (= arsis) in the [illegible] pianissimo, as he does for the [illegible] of the [illegible] [illegible]. The [illegible]

right unit and many others which are not pyrrhic in use, [illegible] [illegible] this principle. [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] the stress of the [illegible] in prose. For this mere stress, though subordinated and subservient to the rhythmical stress, never disappears in verse and is always relatively important enough to require attention.

To illustrate the above principles: [illegible]

(1) [illegible] is [illegible] and slightly stressed in prose, but as it is here to stand in verse as an iamb we must read it

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
foot about which there is no doubt.

(2) In the second line above we [illegible] foot in question iambic feet with a proper arsis in each. We need, therefore, from the machine of feet only one more arsis. How are we to get but one arsis from the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]ly and heavily stressed in prose? We get but one arsis by adding the metrical stress to but one of the two [illegible]. Thus we get [illegible]

[illegible]

Though the type line may be said to be

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] . [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

The foot $-\,\check{-}$ would never be used throughout the whole line, but it may be used a number of times:

[illegible]

[illegible]

(3) In (1) and (2) we have [illegible] jext $\cup\,\breve{\cup}$ and $-\,\check{-}$ only in what might be called their normal environment. In such condi[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible], which in prose are [illegible]

[illegible]

the rhythmic [illegible]. Suppose, however, [illegible] $\cup\,\breve{\cup}$ is [illegible] $-\,\check{-}$, there [illegible]

which is unstressed in prose, will be the accent though it directly followed by a thesis which which has more prose stress, and not, as in the combination seen under (1) ⏑ ⏑ | – –, the equal prose stress. Verse stress is able to accomplish this, but there [illegible] a [illegible]

[illegible].

Examples are: I 217 bŭt vĕ | bītter fŏr thĕ |

[illegible]

[illegible]

I 452 wounded thĕ | love tie,

II 818 | mĕ, thĕ | dim plains |, etc., etc.

¶ [illegible]

choice whether the prose accent of the a[illegible] of the first foot shall be considered inferior or equal to the prose accent of the th[illegible] of the second foot, as in X 717,

[illegible]; but whose [illegible] |, or

[illegible]; but | [illegible], [illegible] |.

[illegible]

There is ~~[illegible]~~ a common method of [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
what appears [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] in [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible], [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [Cf Phil. paper on [illegible]]

(1) [illegible]

(2) [illegible] written [illegible], & makes [illegible] with [illegible]

(3) The [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] in [illegible]

From ~~[illegible]~~ a common [illegible] [illegible] of this combina-tion [illegible] [illegible] called [illegible] [illegible] of [illegible], [illegible] [illegible] of in this version is shown thus [illegible] stresses disappear.] I find some 175 instances of this kind of conflict of stress in the poem. This is probably in excess of the number most people would allow; although the professional metricians who [illegible] the ~~[illegible]~~ prose stresses, would doubtless, if they were to accept (as they do not) the doctrine of stress conflict, see many more examples of it than I.

(3) It [illegible] [illegible] the end of a line, as in I 30, 40, 82, 97, 12-, 217, 235, 265, 356, 379, 452, 4[illegible]. For a tendency shown by this combination [illegible] them, see section 14, p.135.

~~(4)~~ It may be that the conj[illegible]
= 3 b

It happens to be found only 3 times in the [illegible].
[illegible] a line, where I marked it ††, & the following lines:

~~Does [illegible] here? [illegible]~~
for [illegible] cf p 130

† insert obscene(?) from p 149

[illegible] ite in [illegible]

A [illegible] in footnotes ——————

[illegible] B — & [illegible] precipitation, numeration p 199

[illegible] C [illegible]

(5 [illegible])

[illegible]

[illegible] cf p 1[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] of one word [illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

This phenomenon of [illegible]

[illegible] It is found only as follows (for the use of ` see p. 101): *àgainst* II 71, VI 813, 906, X 931, 1045; *amòng* III 283, VII [illegible] IX 547; *bècomes* XII 409; *bèfore* VIII 464; *bètween* VII 473; *bèyond* II 7, V 159, X 4[illegible]; *cònfus'd* II 615; *èxcept* II 1032; † *[illegible]* II 1[illegible]; *sùprēme* I 735, II 210; *ùnless* VIII 18[illegible].

[For *[illegible]*, *[illegible]* [illegible] see p. 133] + add quintessence p 146

→ We have seen that the [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] — —. [illegible]

and instead of using for our iambus a[illegible] prose combination light or heavy (⏑⏑ or — —), we may use even a descent in [illegible] combination — ⏑ the [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] *yielding* [illegible]

[illegible] Through [illegible]

Here [illegible]

[illegible]

II 502 [illegible]

II 526 [illegible]

as in XI 247 of trees;| Trŭs|hăd dī|

X 971 [illegible]

The [illegible]

[illegible] are: (a) It shall not occur in the [illegible] final foot; (b) It shall not occur in two successive feet; (c) It shall occur only after a distinctly marked verse pause, initial or caesural. As we have seen in the [illegible]

cf. (1)
[9.
[7] (c)
[11] (l)

[illegible]

[illegible]

It seems too that initial [illegible], may take on the trochaic [illegible]. Mr. Bridges says, p.17, "Initial weak feet are [illegible] [illegible] a slight accent will be given in reading to the first of them so that the foot is [illegible] by inversion", and he cites I 49:

And in luxurious cities etc.

Again, p.19, he says "As a [illegible] rule, when the first foot is weak it will strengthen itself by [illegible] conventional inversion in spite of the sense e.g. I 259 *We shall be free* ".

This however is often a matter of individual choice, and I should prefer [illegible] read each of the initial feet above cited as [illegible].

According to the above restrictions (a) and (b), trochaic substitution must occur

as follows, in the [illegible]:

In the 1st, (2nd), 3rd, or 4th, foot;

In the 1st and 3rd, 1st and 4th, or (2nd and 4th), feet.

[illegible]

[illegible] foot. [illegible]

upon the first foot is rare, inversion in the second place is very infrequent. It is [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] feet would be even rarer

There is one peculiar and valuable [illegible] ed by trochaic substitution, — an effect which I have not seen recognized by metricians. It is when the trochaic foot precedes a foot beginning with a heavy thesis, thus: $\overset{\vee}{-} \cup | - \overset{\vee}{-}$, as in [illegible], Came the mild [illegible]. In this combi[illegible]

[illegible] has a peculiar [illegible] prom-
ence, due to the fact that it follows
[illegible], and a light, thesis [Note that
the thesis of an inverted foot is always
light, for if the prose combination in a given
this foot were — —, it would not be in-
verted but would appear as — ˘, as in
VI 197 Sīdelŏ̌ng,| hăd pūsht etc].

Usually, of course, a heavy (as a light) thesis is preceded by an arsis, not by another thesis. This arsis may be (a) heavy, as in [illegible] (b), or it may be light, as in thĕ| lōve-tăle|. In the latter case it is true that the prose accent of love outweighs that of the; but the prominence of love is materially diminished by the fact that the, though weak in prose, is still an arsis. In the former case (a), on the other hand, new

is [illegible] syllable [illegible] and in [illegible] at that, [illegible] the prominence of [illegible] is [illegible]

But when an inverted foot precedes the foot — ˘, the heavy thesis is brought into peculiar distinctness by contrast with the [illegible] preceding.

It [illegible] Saxon verse types D and E, we have the two [illegible] they are differentiated, held apart — so to speak, — by the difference of their accent level, one of the theses having the secondary stress. [illegible] The [illegible] part of a line with initial inversion, is much more exact if [illegible]

between the [illegible] E[illegible] and the [illegible] combination of the trochaic foot plus a [illegible] [illegible] foot; compare, that is, [illegible] (´ × ` ´), and Came the mud [illegible] [illegible].

I find about 175 examples of [illegible] inverted foot plus — ˘, counting both the [illegible] when the inverted foot is initial and when it is after the caesura. [illegible] [illegible] caesura than it is initially. [illegible] I 28 north the deep tract, I 55 B[illegible] [illegible], I 1[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

(b) [illegible], trochaic [illegible]

Transfer to p 125, before (10)

the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

this not, for instance, allowed in the pi[illegible] foot, and according to [illegible] VI 472

[illegible]

[illegible] all, [illegible] [illegible], [illegible], etc.

[Compounding a concomitant cause preventing the inversion here, is the lack of a [illegible] [illegible] immediately preceding [illegible], and therefore the words under that head are included in the list of words under (8)]

(7) Trochaic substitution is prevented, [9] again, by an immediately preceding inversion. [In this instance, too, a concomitant cause preventing the second inversion is [illegible] [illegible]; and hence the words illustrating the following phenomenon are also found in the list under (8)]

There is no [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] I am [illegible] iambic lines in [illegible]

a prose combination such as — ◡ — — = lov[illegible] [illegible]

which is accomplished of course by [illegible]

[redacted]

one syllable in the second foot, [illegible] [illegible]

But very easily the prose combination — ◡ — — inclines to, and passes into, the form — ◡ — ◡. Passing into this form are, considered as prose, II 381 [illegible] and what a I, IV 556 On a sunbeam, V 667 Soon as mid-

[redacted]

considered as prose, VI 641 Sweet with [illegible], II [illegible] Universal, XI 74 by the waters, VIII 299 [illegible],

[redacted]

tion to be accommodated to iambic verse? We shall see below under (8) and (9) that two syllables accented in prose — ◡, as [illegible],

[redacted]

substitution is not possible, since it is now [illegible]

[illegible] the usual thesis [illegible]

[illegible], than sārăn. Having accounted [illegible] this rule

[illegible] the third and fourth columns [illegible] the

[illegible] — — = [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

— — = [illegible]. [

[illegible]

sārăn, and especially well after a trochee. It is this: We have seen that the heavy thesis in the

[illegible]

than the heavy thesis in the combination, con-

[illegible] dīs|īter wăiē, due to the fact that in the first instance the preceding [illegible] throws it (= the heavy thesis) into [illegible] prominence. For the same reason, in the form — ˘ = [illegible]ărăn, or Sārăn, the thesis is [illegible] [illegible] a trochee as in [illegible]

than it is after an iamb, as in gather [illegible]

how it is weaker than in [illegible]

[illegible] above [illegible] a prominent [illegible]

[illegible], if it cannot stand in the [illegible], the [illegible]

[illegible] for it is the most prominent [illegible]]

In the above way scan also:

[illegible]   [illegible]

Bĕ̆ thĕ wātĕ̆rs   Ĭ̆n thĕ vīsĭons.

As to the stability of the foot — ᵕ = gārdĕn, both after a trochee and an iamb, see p. 128.

If [illegible] preceded by a normal foot [illegible], a foot can be [illegible] only after a caesura; so that in the open wide | Satan, since there is no caesura, the third foot is as much an iamb as the other two. The prose stress Satan is of course — ᵕ, but since it is to form an iamb, the verse stress shall

iambic foot as Sātăn, there is always conflict of verse and prose stress, as there is also in the combinations treated in [illegible] (2) and (4), an example of (3) being thĕ, love-[illegible]. In the latter case, however, the conflict is between the thesis and the arsis of different feet, and there is no reconciliation of prose and verse stress possible. In the case of Sātăn, the conflict is between the verse and prose stresses of the arsis and thesis of the same foot; and reconciliation of the stresses by inversion may take place under circumstances already treated. When, however, the foot is not preceded by a [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] or at the caesura, the conflict [illegible] [illegible] and the foot [illegible] in the [illegible]

or not a strong [illegible] caesura [illegible] following in-
version exist at a certain point, [illegible]
corresponding [illegible] appearance of opposition [illegible]
stance, when the [illegible] — ⏑ [illegible]
[illegible] as an iamb — ⏑̆, or whether it [illegible]
[illegible] into a trochee ⏑́ ⏑. For [illegible]

[illegible]

caesura for a following inversion (which may

[illegible]

question; thus in V 750

In their triple degrees; regions in which,

there is unquestionably no inversion-caesura after their, as there is one after degrees, the [illegible]

[illegible]

To escape from the uncertain[illegible] of [illegible] [illegible]tion, it may be fairly assumed that [illegible] [illegible] verse-caesura shall be considered [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] at a punctuation point. Upon this principle I find some 64 words in the poem whose prose accent is — ∪, but which [illegible] an iamb in the verse, being therefore scanned — ∪̀.

An approximately full list of the words which resist trochaic inversion, whether on account of their final position (see [illegible]), or of an immediately preceding trochee (see [illegible]), [illegible] [illegible], is as follows (only one passage apiece being cited). (— For the use of ` see p 101 —) The arrangement is made according to the endings which bear the verse stress.

-ace: sūrfàce VI 472; -age: Ìmàge VII 527; -al: Ēquàl'd III 33, ūnivērsàl VI 34, trīàl IX 370;

add, azure VII 479, from p 146

transfer to this space from p 1:1 —

a ~~[illegible] Quintessence, Carbuncle, [illegible]~~

~~[illegible] painting [illegible]~~; p 146

[illegible]

p 1:0

-ledge: knowledge VII 543; -ier: ladder II 177, [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] I 345, [illegible] I 504, [illegible] IV 807, [illegible] V 8[illegible], other V 844, mightier VI 32, [illegible] VI [illegible], worthier IX 100, over X 253, waters X 7[illegible]; -ed:

[illegible]

rally-d) VI 786, glories (the second) X 722, [illegible] X 936; -ing: rolling II 573, shading III 357, listening VII 106, borrowing VII 377, [illegible] IX

[illegible]

X 289, arming XI 394; -le: sprinkled III 64[illegible], [illegible] V 750; -on: visions XI 377; -ure: [illegible] IV 207, future X 540; -u: argues II 234

[For audibly, "bottomless, infinite", "[illegible] carbuncle [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]]

9 The [illegible]

the above section, may belong to [illegible]: VI 96 Against God and Messiah, or to [illegible], in

which the [illegible] of foot is [illegible] (— ⏑). The two word composition of the foot — ⏑ is much more common than its one word composition. [illegible] not inverting into a trochee after a comma. Examples without strong caesura:

I 23 is low | raise and | ; II 304 [illegible] | in his ; II 731 [illegible] | falls to | . Examples with a strong caesura: IV 123

[illegible]

IV 800 Squat like a toad, | close at the ear of Eve. One may choose, however, to invert these just after the medial caesura.

Of course a very important element to be considered in each case is the relative strength and weakness of the two words; for — ⏑ can [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] — [illegible]

There are now to be discussed certain combinations of feet, which have peculiarity of effect and which are unstable, i.e. they tend in a natural reading to alter [illegible] ([illegible] to the [illegible], generally)

(a) [illegible] syllables that have in prose descending rythm, as *triple*, *Satan* = $-\cup$, may be put into verse as an iamb, the ascending verse rythm being marked by the verse stress. They should then be scanned $-\breve{\cup}$ and will not invert into the trochaic $\overset{\vee}{-}\cup$ unless certain above-named conditions be fulfilled. Such conditions are [illegible] tictions, unless the contrary is specifically expressed, and we deal with the foot in the un-

— 3. If the foot is in the body of
the line, ~~in~~ its normal environment it will [illegible]

stress between raise and and; but between
and and sup- there is a prose level, and

sup- we have a heavy syllable. Then, even
in, the verse stress of the right [illegible] and
will have conflict with the prose stress of the
syllable after it, as well as with that be-

insert [illegible] p. 17 + [illegible]

XII 4 [illegible]

Initially and after a [illegible]
-tion of the first [illegible] of this combination
[illegible] XI 70
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 112.

(11) [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] is lightened and we get [illegible]
in X 178 And dust shalt éat|all thĕ|days ŏf|t[illegible].
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
Bў thĕ|waters, and VI 34 Universal, etc, as

Insert, on a sheet at end of [illegible]

[illegible] = [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] in which the spondee [illegible] occurring only in the 2 second foot.

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] by a [illegible] of [illegible] in the second foot. But there are [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] which are not allowable in iambic measure.

It is to be noted that the foot —˘ is [illegible] in the second [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] (see [illegible]), or [illegible] [illegible] (see [illegible]). These are [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] (see [illegible]). This is due to the [illegible] [illegible] the second [illegible] the [illegible] inst foot [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] first syllable [illegible] [illegible]. Whereas the heavy [illegible] of the [illegible] foot [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] the heavy thesis has gained peculiar prominence and tends to take the verse stress away from its [illegible] [illegible]. That is the [illegible] [illegible] more examples $\delta^1_1(12)$ on p. 133 + 139

[illegible]

the two feet strongly, when the second foot is [illegible]).

(12) We have just seen that the foot − ⏑ is un[illegible] instance when it follows a trochee, as in "Tollite [illegible]" due to the fact of its being preceded by the [illegible] light thesis. But − ⏑ is also unstable [illegible] preceded by a light arsis thus ⏑ ⏑, − ⏑, = [illegible] to|," etc. [illegible]

[illegible] the [illegible]

[illegible] always somewhat unstable [illegible] foot − ⏑ = [illegible] is not [illegible]

[illegible] to [illegible]
prose accent ; but it is incumbent to the [illegible]
ending foot, for this is conjoined [illegible]
between ănd and fēar. Further than [illegible]

[illegible] tŏ. [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

having the prose stress. In the phrase just [illegible]
the arses ănd and tŏ are both in conflict
with the heavy thesis fēar. But reconciliation
take place and we get the reversion!

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] of thesis and arsis forms two ascending
trisyllabic feet, and the line becomes

[illegible] éon [illegible]

Of course in this stanza form the line can [illegible]
in pentameter verse, as it has two [illegible]
feet and only four or [illegible]. [illegible]

from tongue, with its various parts, [illegible]

[illegible].

In previous sections we have treated the foot — ˘ = Satăn, as followed by a foot of normal form, and as preceded by different kinds of feet. Then the constant part of the combinations treated was — ˘|⏑ —, and this was preceded in (8) by a normal foot = ⏑ —, in (11) by an inverted foot ˊ ⏑, and in (12) by a light iamb ⏑ ˘. Now ~~in~~ the words: āudìblē VII 518 (for the use of ` see p. 101), bōttòmless VI 866, īnfìnīte V 874, ōdòrōus V 483, pōpùlār VII 488, (īnvīsìblē III 586, VII 122) [The negative prefix in- is thus marked as accented levelly with the word visible in analogy to the compounds cited on p. 146, especially the important [illegible]. [illegible]] have nearly level stress in prose, for to each [illegible] in

[illegible]

find in verse unvisited and [illegible] or [illegible]

[illegible] and similarly [illegible] or [illegible].

[illegible]

from the calling up of the weak secondary stress into the in the

[illegible]

word invision, as well as all the other words cited in this and the next paragraph, and the lists of words given in sections (4) and (8)], vōlùbĭlĕ IX 436, lighten their strong secondary stress when standing immediately before strongly stressed words in the cited passages, and [illegible] [illegible] etc, which also scanned — ˘ | – ⏑, where the unusual use is made of the weak secondary stress, ~~that~~ it shall bear the arsis, — a phenomenon to be paralleled in sections (4) and (8).

[illegible]

the differing of the foot preceding the consonant combination — ˘ | ⏑

transfer to (#) [9] = (7)

[illegible] (f), [illegible]

[illegible] spake   this [illegible]
[illegible]   [illegible].

With preceding light iamb ᴗ ᴗ̆, like (12), as :-
[illegible]   [illegible]
[illegible] (11), as :-
[illegible]   [illegible].

Remarks concerning the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible].

These words are classed together, 1st because the weak secondary accent here utilized for the arsis follows the main accent; and 2nd [illegible] two arses as bót|tomless|, though here yielding only one.

On the other hand àmbitiòus VI 160, còn-jùgal V 413, ìmpetuòus II 850, are classed to-

either 1st because [illegible] weak [illegible] occurring, [illegible] between pauses for arsis, both preceding and [illegible] the strong word thesis; and 2nd because these words generally yield only one arsis as ămbĭtĭŏus, [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Caution: These words must not be scanned ambítĭ-oús|, corpórĕ-al, unfit, u-ous. For thus there is made with the last eight syllables of [illegible] [illegible] ation etc., p. 149.

(13) When a foot in the form – – ˘ is not only preceded by a light arsis as in (12), but is also followed by a heavy thesis we get the con-

transfer no 4 to after 3b or 4 p 105

bination ⏑ ⏑̌ | — ⏑̌ , — —̌ , = VI 906 done against the most High.
Here the two stress conflicts, as is very plain in the read-
ing, are between a- and -gainst, and the and most. [illegible]
[illegible]

done against | the most High|. This is evidently a
reconciliation between ă- and -gainst. But it is just as
a reconciliation between thĕ and mōst; for in a
trisyllabic foot of whatever form, whether × × ×̀
[illegible]
verse stress, indicated by ` above, is always pos-
sible on the syllable just preceding the arsis.
Of course the unstable form, not the stable, is
required in VI 906, and in every parallel occur-
rence.

(14) (a) In (3) and (4) we treated the combi-
nation ⏑ ⏑ | — —̌ , = [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
in the line, and that when not fixed it is

somewhat ambiguous in form. To explain. The non-final form, which is ambiguous, is constructed thus, ∪ ∪̆ | — ∸ | [illegible] ∪ — [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] is [illegible]

(3), is, to illustrate by the first example, between *thĕ* and *first*. Reconciliation of stress would require *first* to become the arsis, when *laws*, following immediately by it, would have to lose its verse stress to *first* also. The result would be *and the fírst | laws of héaven |*. But in this arrangement, *laws*, with its important prose stress, has sunk to a very inferior verse position; and consequently this latter mode of scansion is no more stable (i.e. no more in conformity with prose accentuation) than the former. Of course the latter form could not stand in iambic pentameter.

(b) When the combination ∪ ∪̆ | − ⏒ is final, as in I 217, b̆ut tŏ | brīng fŏrth, (and final it usually is) the form is less ambiguous than under (a). The variant form would be | bŭt tŏ brĭng fōrth |, a trisyllabic foot with feminine ending. But the impropriety that fōrth, so strongly stressed in prose, should sink to the second syllable of a feminine ending (a very light position), makes the first scansion of final ∪ ∪ − − the natural (and so, stable) one, namely ∪ ∪̆ | − ⏒

(c) For examples of the combination ∪ ∪ − − in its non-final use (as discussed in 14a), employed in both triple and double time, compare this line from Browning's "Love

[illegible]

and, [illegible], II 11.

[illegible]

And bade him make a [illegible]

[illegible]

and I [illegible], but [illegible].

These two ~~sets of~~ comparisons show [illegible]

[illegible]

The second part of this paper has been seen to deal so far chiefly with a fact in its relation to the fact on either side of it. It is hoped that the chief phenomena have been indicated. We do not pro-pose [illegible] line, the effect of which depends upon the [illegible] the fact. [illegible]

[illegible], which is confined to the [illegible] -

the symbolism used has recommended [illegible],

the employment of ˘ and – for syllabic stress, and ˇ for verse stress.

Verse stress. Generally verse stress coin-

with which it is then in its effect identical.

coincidence does not occur, (A) in a [illegible]

(B) when the prose stress is ascending or de-
scending, while the verse demands an oppo-
site inclination, as In their | sleep[illegible], or
a goddess among gods|.

evident that if these words triple and among are to stand in verse they must accommodate themselves to its rhythm. But it is absurd to imagine that their commonly and individually [illegible] used accent (the prose use) should be [illegible] swept aside and that they should be [illegible] triplé, ámong, — forms which would seem [illegible] abnormal to the ordinary ear. What then can be the ~~[illegible]~~ compromise between prose accent and verse demand?

[illegible] and pitch, of which the former is the [illegible] [illegible] pitch element. The twofold nature of the accent immediately suggests a means of compromise between prose stress and verse

requirements. [illegible]

[illegible] of the verse, while the [illegible] in its own position and keeps the word in its normal form. Accordingly.

(1) We may choose to let expiratory stress remain in its prose position, and to let the pitch mark the arsis; or

(2) We may mark the prose accent by pitch, and let the expiratory stress indicate the [illegible].

Inasmuch as the expiratory stress [illegible] is the more noticeable, the first of these methods would seem to conserve particularly strongly the prose effect of the words, while the second would [illegible] the [illegible].

We may choose between the two methods and read in either way we please; but it is presumed that there is but one [illegible]

[illegible]. As [illegible] i [illegible] [illegible] press an opinion; but it is [illegible] question that whenever there is a conflict between speech stress and verse demand, both must be [illegible].

An objection may be raised. One may say "when -ple of triple, and a of among, for example, appear in the arsis, these syllables acquire prominence, even though the prose accent be at the same time in some manner marked. What is the propriety of these insignificant syllables having a prominent position?" The answer is that these and similar [illegible] much ~~cast into the shade~~ overshadowed by the presence of strong accent in the very next syllable; [illegible] may be seen when these syllables are removed from the immediate neighborhood [illegible]

of [illegible] accent. The [illegible] prominence even in prose that they are [illegible] put into the [illegible] in [illegible]. The unusual thing is, not that such [illegible] [illegible] into prominence in the unfavourable position of immediate neighbourhood to a heavy stress. To bring this about, the heavy stress [illegible] lowered to a thesis, and then we get the stress conflict so often mentioned: Thesis with natural prose accent, arsis (metrical [illegible]) prose stress, and a distinguishing kind of accent for each. It is to be noted that there is a marked difference between the [illegible] ment of such words. In the older language the primary stressed was retained as an

[illegible] in [illegible] poetry, in reading [illegible] [illegible] to the principle [illegible]. [illegible] is necessary, at [illegible] in [illegible] [illegible], the primary stress [illegible] [illegible] to the thesis. The occurrences of this phenomenon are given in the lists on pp. 108, 122, 131, 133."

(A) In a level foot, whether heavy or light, [illegible] accent: light — served | ĭt tŏ [illegible] this | new word |. Here the arsis will be sufficiently indicated and differentiated from the thesis by the least emphasis either of expiratory force or of pitch. There is no conflict of stresses in such feet.

In a polysyllabic word, the secondary [illegible] from the main word stress, as in charity, is somewhat more forcibly pronounced even in prose than the inter-

[illegible], [illegible] to make any accentual addition to the prose stress of the [illegible] when putting such a word into verse, as the prose accent seems unaided to differentiate [illegible] from thesis.

We have seen above in (B) the explanation [illegible] go into verse at an inclination just the reverse of that of their prose stress, namely as tīplĕ and ămōng. This phenomenon [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

† [illegible]

A From p. 148 insert after [illegible] only one occurrence apiece.

B Insert ~~[illegible]~~ [illegible] /
+ [illegible] ~~[illegible]~~

Azure + Carbuncle to p 123
Quarterings to p 108

[illegible], [illegible], [illegible], [illegible], [illegible]
consort, [illegible] [illegible], [illegible]
[illegible], [illegible], [illegible], ~~[illegible]~~, [illegible]
[illegible], midnight, quintessence, [illegible],

therein, unblest, unsurmount† upright, un-
[illegible], whereat, whereon, wherein, [illegible]
whereon, without, etc.

Three of the above words to be [illegible] are carbúncle III 596, cárbuncle IX [illegible]; quintessence III 716, quintéssence VII 244; azúre VII 479 and IX 429, azure I 297.

IX 429 Carnátion, púrple, azúre, or speckt

In these last two cases Mr Bridges [illegible]

from p [illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]

Varying form for Nouns + Verbs

next pp in [illegible]
Foreign [illegible]

become, quite uncommon. He [illegible] [illegible] the syllable t of profile, occurs again on the last syllable, and even -ure (of [illegible]) before the following vowel. However if -ure had given ə, it is very seldom seen (cf. p. 93); but we must not confound the weakening of -ure in this word to ə or [illegible] [illegible] use kept the full u-sound and made the [illegible] of the two syllables nearly or quite level. [illegible]

The words [illegible] importune, incense, subject, torment, are accented on the second syllable when verbs, on the first when nouns or adjectives (P. [illegible] has the adjective impórtune [illegible] II 404).

Among foreign verbs not having recession of accent are contemplate, illuminate, and Romanize do p 18,

[illegible]

Among many nouns and adjectives of foreign [illegible] [illegible] (noun as well as adjective), insult, medicine (cf. Lat. [illegible]), obdurate, [illegible] extreme, sinister, and numerous others, ([illegible]) [illegible]

Many native compound nouns [illegible] when occurring a number of times, are [illegible], which [illegible] be used.

We [illegible] compound [illegible] out-do (occurring once), and farewell (noun [illegible]

[illegible]

well-wrought have initial acc[illegible]

The following words are to be added: —

Óbscēne. This word occurs but once, I 406. It may be an example of level or even stress, ōbscēne, or of ascending prose stress with conflict of stresses in the verse, when it would be scanned ŏbscēne and belong with ōbscūre under Section 4, p.108.

Áccessóries, ácceptáble, ácceptácle, cóntribúte, áttribúte.

própitiátion XI 34, and húmilia[illegible] III 313, X 1042, X 1104 (and P.R. I 160), must be

scanned as marked. If we scan these words hu-mil-i-á-tion etc., we get the funny tri-syllabic marked off foot in X 1092

Of sórrow unféign'd | and hu-mil-i-á-tion méek.

[illegible]: | and hú|mili|át-ion etc. Similarly in the other passages cited. (Cf remark on ana-[illegible] p. 134)

~~In like manner we~~ [illegible]

Ægæ-an in I 746,

On Lemnos the Ægæan isle, and similarly, probably, in P.R. IV 238,

[illegible]

line it would be possible to scan

Where on | the Ægæan shore ----

The proper names Térnate and Tidore II 639, are accented as marked, and scan the [illegible].

The classical form Prosérpina IX 396 is partially anglicized in IV 269 by the omis

cf. I 7 = [illegible] Sérapis [illegible]

[illegible] m[illegible]

[illegible]
classical accen (unlike English of today), [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] Ecbátaná PR III 286, and Ecbátan
[illegible].

Dalila, IX 1061, is accented on the first syllable.

As to the initial combination of III 36,
And Tiresias and Phineus, prophets old,
according to Latin accent the first proper-name is accented Tirésias. The other al-
[illegible]
with double initial thesis which is unknown in P. L., and And Tiré|si-ás, with synco-
[illegible]
non-occurrent in the initial foot, and also unthinkable in such an unparalleled word

For accentuation of to-ward(s) when
incomplete see p. 86.

as this. The explanation is, I think, that [illegible]

[illegible]

which transferred into English would have, of course, ~~for [illegible]~~ by the principle of alternation of heavy and light stresses ~~in a [illegible]~~, a [illegible] accent on the initial [illegible]. By putting this [strong] accent stress into the verse (~~[illegible]~~), Synizese [illegible] etc,

p [illegible]

And Tiresias and Phineus, prophesied

unto ye. [illegible]

[illegible]

occurrence: deities VI 157, the diphthong oe (as in [illegible] VIII 2[illegible], [illegible] XI 24[illegible], etc.

pursuers

Life

I was born [illegible] 18[illegible] in [illegible] Maryland. [illegible] years of my [illegible] education I studied at the [illegible] University School for Boys for the six years 1885-1891. I then entered the Johns Hopkins University and studied mathematics for [illegible] years and the classics for three, getting the degree of Bachelor of Arts in 1895. After half a year of advanced Classical work, and half a year spent in the study of the elements of Anglo-Saxon, I took up in 1896 graduate English work under Dr. James W. Bright, and courses in German under Dr. Henry Wood. For valuable [illegible] grammar I am much indebted to Dr. [illegible].

My particular attention has been called to metrical subjects by Dr. Bright's [illegible] [illegible].